

June 1, 1973

you and I are in agreement that we will have to raise the mill levy on the local level without the restraint and there is no restrictions as to the amount that they can raise it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fellman.

SENATOR FELLMAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I was one of the people who voted for LB472 and I also voted for LB172 hoping that or feeling fairly confident that one or possibly both of the bills would be vetoed and in the course of the week or ten days from the time the vote was taken a lot of the pieces of the puzzle would fall into place and come together and the situation would be a little easier to understand than we last considered the bills. I rise today to point out that for me at least as one person sitting in this legislature a number of these pieces have begun to fall into place. I am pleased that the 20 million dollars will be going into the school system. I don't think that those of us who say we are for increase support for schools should feel bad at all when we have helped put that additional 20 million dollars into the school system for the benefit of the school children of this state. We are now having to be faced with the question of LB472 and I for one after a good deal of though have come to the conclusion to vote against the bill to vote to sustain the Governor's veto. I might point out that I have not talked to the Governor. Nor has he talked to me. I have spoken to a number of people however who I think that have not only knowledge but also concern about this bill and its affects. I have been struck by the fact that the teachers in Omaha speaking through their representatives have said and maintained that they can not live with the bill. I have been impressed by the Omaha Board of Education when they said that they don't want the bill passed. I have been impressed that the suburban schools, some of which I represent in Omaha, have had sort of mixed feelings and haven't come out strongly for or against but have taken the attitude that the bill is good as a foot in the door and I have supported that idea thinking that it was a foot in the door. Then I began to think that we put a 20 million dollar foot in the door that is there. That is a good place to stop....or rather start. Then I have begun to listen to people who represent the legitimate interests of the people who pay the sales tax and the income tax and the biggest share of those taxes. The person who earns the average income and who pays a flat income tax with a straight deduction with no monkey business and no games and the person who spends the majority of his income in the necessities of life all of which are taxed by the sales tax. Representatives and spokesmen lobbyists, and members of this body speaking for this group of people say that they think it is bad for those people. There is no reduction in real estate taxes and there is no reduction in the tax that a tenant or a renter then pays or there is an increased sales tax which hits the farmer probably harder than any other consumer. There is an increased sales tax that hits everybody that goes to the grocery store, that everybody that buys clothing for their families and the necessities of life. Now we were told by the Attorney General that we couldn't do what we would have wanted to do because of the limitations of the constitution. I am beginning to think today that the right place to have started would have been with the appropriate constitutional amendment, then the right state aid might have been developed. I'm not sure that I have learned very much in this legislature, but one thing that I have learned is that we don't pass and we can't ever expect to pass perfect legislation so to argue the a...a...that this bill isn't perfect, I don't think is the right argument. But to argue that a far better